

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-21 remain pending in the application. Claims 1-21 have been rejected. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abramov et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,486,832 B1) in view of Regnier et al. (U.S. Patent Application Number 2003/0222818). These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following exemplary reasons.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Abramov et al. and Regnier et al., alone or in combination, does not disclose or suggest “*processing a plurality of recorded relative angular positions of the approximate maximum gain vectors and a plurality of recorded received strengths of the transmitted beacons to determine relative radio positions of the plurality of WAPs within the WLAN,*” as claimed in independent Claim 1, and similarly claimed in amended independent Claims 9 and 17.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s statement on pages 3-4 of the Detailed Action that “*Regnier clearly discloses ... processing a plurality of recorded relative angular positions of the approximate maximum gain vectors and a plurality of recorded received strengths of the transmitted beacons to determine relative radio positions of the plurality of WAPs within the WLAN,*” as shown in paragraph 16, lines 1-5, paragraph 33, lines 1-6 and paragraph 54, lines 1-25 of Regnier.

The cited passages of Regnier describe a method for achieving the optimal antenna directional angle by measuring and storing respective signal quality metrics at a number of different directional angles of the antenna. However, there is no mention or suggestion in the cited passages or elsewhere within Regnier that the “*plurality of recorded relative angular*

*positions” and the “plurality of recorded received strengths” are used “to determine relative radio positions of the plurality of WAPs within the WLAN,” as claimed in the present invention.*

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-21 are not obvious over the prior art of record. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the § 103 rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 10, 12-14, 17-20 and 22-24.

### **CONCLUSION**

As a result of the foregoing, the Applicant asserts that the remaining claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests an early allowance of such claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Garlick Harrison & Markison Deposit Account No. 50-2126 (Ref. BP2488.2).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 3, 2007

/Holly L. Rudnick/Reg. No. 43,065

Holly L. Rudnick  
Attorney for Applicant

**Garlick Harrison & Markison**

P.O. Box 160727  
Austin, TX 78716-0727  
(214) 387-8097/office  
(214) 387-7949/facsimile